

Appl. No. 09/195,333
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1
EUS/J/P/05-3226

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 21-24, 28-33 and 37-38 to more clearly and distinctly claim the Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 21-39 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 23, 28, 29, 32 and 37 were objected to because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims and has amended the claims to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The language objected to in claims 21 and 30 has been removed and the vague and indefinite phrase noted in claims 21 and 30 has been amended. Claims 22, 24, 28, 31, 33, and 37 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem in each claim. The remaining claims, 25-27, 29, 32, 34-36, and 38 are rejected because of their dependency on indefinite claims. The Applicants have corrected the deficiencies.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 21-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,161,180 in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0055299 to Kelly. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The present invention provides a method and system for routing emergency calls in an encapsulated message containing physical location

Appl. No. 09/195,333
Amtd. Dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1
EUS/JP/05-3228

information from an Internet connected device over an IP network to an emergency call handling function in an emergency call center. The emergency call handling function is configured to examine the message's IP address and return physical location information of the device, which transmitted the emergency request message. The physical location information may include the number of the PSAP associated with a central office in the service zone of the caller.

The Chavous reference appears to disclose a method and system for determining the location of a PBX extension phone in a PBX system. A device is installed between the PBX and the extensions and the location of each extension is stored in the device's memory. When 911 is dialed from an extension, the extension connects to a second device in the PSAP. The PSAP device interrogates the PBX device to determine the location of the extension phone behind the PBX.

The Kelly reference appears to disclose a method and apparatus for enabling packet switched networks and circuit switched networks to communicate. The domain name infrastructure is used to resolve PSTN telephone numbers into domain names. As noted in the Detailed Action, Kelly discloses an IP telephone connected to a PBX, a feature in common with the Chavous reference.

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to currently amended claim 21.

21. (Currently Amended) A method of routing an emergency request message from an Internet device through the Internet to an emergency call answering center connected to a Public Service Access Point (PSAP), comprising the steps of:

routing the emergency request message to an emergency call handling function configured to determine the IP address of the Internet device;

Appl. No. 09/195,333
Arndt, Dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1
EUS/JP/05-3226

translating the IP address to a physical location utilizing information retrieved from an Internet Service Provider (ISP) associated with the Internet device;
encapsulating the physical location information within a PSAP message; and
sending the emergency request message through Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) to a PSAP in an emergency response service zone serving the Internet device. (emphasis added)

The Chavous and Kelly references have the PBX in common, an element not required or used in the Applicant's invention. The WebPhone client of Kelly is described as inherently disclosing the emergency call handling function being connected to the ISP and that the IP address can be used instead of the PBX extension number. Kelly discloses an online request packet that contains configuration and setting information, email address, IP address for the WebPhone client. (Paragraph 38). What is unique to the applicant's invention, and what is not suggested in the references, is utilizing the IP address of the Internet device and the information required for registering the device with the ISP (available in the ISP) to determine the device's location. However, there is no connection between IP address and the ISP registration to determine physical location in either Chavous or Kelly. In fact, a device installed behind the PBX in Chavous provides the physical location of an extension served by the PBX and there appears to be no requirement for a physical location in the Kelly reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Chavous and Kelly references together fail to disclose a number of the limitations recited in Applicant's claim 21, and specifically neither reference discloses using registration information available in an ISP to determine a physical location of a client device. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21. Amended claim 30 is analogous to, and contains limitations similar to, the Kelly reference. All claims dependent from independent claims 21 and 30 are also distinguishable from the Chavous and Kelly references and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-39.

Appl. No. 09/195,333
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1
EUS/J/P/05-3226

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com